



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,759	11/12/2003	Peter Schwarze	34874-359/2003P0068US	7392

64280. 7590 01/24/2008
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
5355 Mira Sorrento Place
SUITE 600
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER

BARQADLE, YASIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/712,759

Applicant(s)

SCHWARZE, PETER

Examiner

Yasin M. Barqadle

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/9/07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments filed on November 09, 2007 have been considered and are not deemed persuasive.

Response to Argument

2. Applicant argues "Riggins fails to disclose at least the following feature of claim 1" "assigning one or more of a plurality of types with each web service." (page 6, last paragraph). Examiner notes that the Applicant did not specify or define how plurality of types is assigned to each web service. Nevertheless, Riggins teaches "Example services for which services 110a-110d represent include an e-mail service program, an address book service program, a calendar service program, a paging service program, a company database service program, and any of the like." (Col. 4, lines 10-14). Each web service represents (is assigned) to particular type such e-mail service, calendar service, a company database service, etc. In this way when a client accessing web page 700 listed in the client's display, can select any desired web service based on the network addresses of all the services 110a-110d maintained in global server. Therefore, Riggins teaches the second argued limitation of "... in response to a client running the application,

sending a list identifying one or more web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application," as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added.)" Page 7, second paragraph. See page 700 of fig. 7 where a list of web services are displayed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 1,3-5,7,9-16 and 19 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Riggins US Patent Number (6766454).

As per claim 1, Riggins teaches a method comprising (fig.1 and abstract):

storing an address for each of a plurality of services
(col. 4, lines 60-63 and col. 6, lines 52-58);

assigning one of a plurality of types with each web service
(col. 4, lines 10-14);

associating one or more of said plurality of types to an
application (col. 5, lines 29-42 and col. 6, lines 43-65);

in response to a client running the application, send a
list identifying one or more services assigned with the one or
more types associated with the application (col. 5, lines 29-
42; col. 6, lines 17-24 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4)
; and

in response to the user selecting one of the one or more
services in the list, redirect the client to the selected
service (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8,
lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

As per claim 3, Riggins teaches the method of claim 1, wherein
each address is stored in an entry in a table (col. 6, line 17-
25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

As per claim 4, Riggins teaches the method of claim 3, wherein **additional information** relating to the service is stored in the service entry in the table (col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

As per claim 5, Riggins teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said redirecting the client browser comprises generating a URL call (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 7-40. See also col. 9, lines 5-36).

As per claim 7, Riggins teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: opening a new browser at the client for the selected service (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 17).

As per claim 9, Riggins teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: in response to receiving the list at the client, displaying at the client an identifier for each of the one or more services in the list (col. 5, lines 29-42).

As per claim 10, Riggins teaches a system (100, fig. 1) comprising:

a server (see server 106 and 108 in fig. 1) including a plurality of applications (col. 4, lines 10-14), each application associated with one or more service types (col. 4, lines 10-14 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4), and a table including a number of entries, each entry including an address for an external web service and a service type assigned to the external web service col. 4, lines 60-65; col. 6, lines 6, 43-65 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4);

a plurality of clients (clients 114a-114g), each client including a browser (browser 284 fig. 2);

a first networked communication system operative to enable communication between the server and the plurality of clients (fig. 1, network 118) ;

a second networked computer system operative to enable communication between the plurality of clients and external web services (102); and

an integration module (web engine 387 col. 4, lines 46-60 and col. 10, lines 40-61) operative to:

in response to a client opening one of the applications, sending a list identifying one or more external web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application (col. 6, lines 43-62); and

in response to the user selecting one of said web services, redirecting the client browser to the selected web service (col. 4, lines 47-25 and col. 6, lines 16-25 and lines 43-65).

As per claim 11, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the address is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) (col. 4, lines 60-64).

As per claim 12, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the integration module is an API (Application Programming Interface) (col. 4, lines 46-60 and col. 10, lines 40-61).

As per claim 13, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the first networked communication system is an enterprise portal (see company network 112 and 118 in fig. 1)

As per claim 14, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the second networked communication system is the World Wide Web (internet 102. fig. 1).

As per claim 15, Riggins teaches the system 10, wherein the each entry in the table includes additional information about the

corresponding external web service (col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

As per claim 16, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the integration module is operative to generate a URL call to the selected external web service from the entry in the table corresponding to the selected external web service (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 7-40).

As per claim 19, Riggins teaches an article comprising a machine-readable medium including machine-executable instructions operative to cause a machine to (fig.1 and 5):

store an address for each of a plurality of services (col. 4, lines 60-63 and col. 6, lines 52-58);

assign one of a plurality of types with each web service (col. 4, lines 10-14);

associate one or more of said plurality of types to an application (col. 5, lines 29-42 and col. 6, lines 43-65);

in response to a client running the application, send a list identifying one or more services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 6, lines 17-24 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4)
; and

in response to the user selecting one of the one or more services in the list, redirect the client to the selected service (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins US Patent Number (6766454) in view of Jamison USPN. (20030212587).

As per claim 2, Riggins teaches a method comprising (fig.1 and abstract):

storing, at server, an address for each of a plurality of web services, the address including URL (col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4));

assigning, at server, one of a plurality of types with each web service (col. 4, lines 10-14);

associating, at a server, one or more of said plurality of types to an application (col. 5, lines 29-42 and col. 6, lines 43-65);

sending by the server in response to a client running the application, send a list identifying one or more services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 6, lines 17-24 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4) ; and

redirecting, in response to the user selecting one of the one or more web services in the list, the client to the selected web service (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

As per claim 2, although Riggins shows substantial features of the claimed invention as explained in claims 1, Riggins does not explicitly show one of a plurality of business types associated with web service.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Riggins, as evidenced by Dias Jamison USPN. (20030212587).

In analogous art, Jamison discloses one of a plurality of business types associated with web service "UDDI is an industry initiative for a universal business registry or catalog of web services. UDDI is designed to enable software to automatically discover and integrate with services on the World Wide Web. UDDI contains white pages (addresses and contacts), yellow pages (industry classification) and green pages (description of services) (§ 0050 and § 0080). Giving the teaching of Jamison, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Riggins by employing the system of Jamison in order to facilitate communication between two business entities and to coordinate services among web service provider seamlessly.

5. Claims 6,8,17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins US Patent Number (6766454) in view of Dias et al, hereinafter "Dias" USPN. (20030002526).

As per claims 6 and 17, although Riggins shows substantial features of the claimed invention as explained in claims 1 and 10 above, Riggins does not explicitly show wherein the URL call is in an OCI/OPI-compliant format.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Riggins, as evidenced by Dias USPN. (20030002526).

In analogous art, Dias whose invention is about a system of Stateful business-to-business protocol exchange where "The protocol exchange then creates, in block 826, a complete catalog URL, including the location of the supplier catalog, the conversation identifier and a postback URL that points to a location in the protocol exchange that is configured to receive a shopping cart in Ariba cXML format, in a manner consistent with that of block 646 in FIG. 6B. After creating the complete catalog URL, the protocol exchange sends a redirect message to the mySAP buyer's browser to connect it directly to the Ariba supplier system catalog" ¶ 0051, discloses mySAP buyer's browser (URL call) connection utilizing stateful protocols such Open Catalog Interface (OCI) (¶ 0003 and ¶ 0051). Giving the teaching of Dias, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Riggins by employing the stateful Open Catalog Interface (OCI) format of Dias so that that data sent in one of the messages between the entities is used in a subsequent interchange between the entities. One ordinary skill in the art

would use the OCI compliant system of Dias because it provides a framework for facilitating communication between two business entities implemented using different communication protocols (abstract).

As per claim 8, Dias teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving an OCI/OPI-compliant response from the service (0051-0053).

As per claim 18, Dias as modified teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the integration module is operative to receive a response from the selected external web service in an OCI/OPI-compliant format (fig 4 and ¶ 0051-0053).

Conclusion

6. **ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire

on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Bargadle whose telephone number is 571-272-3947. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Y. Barqadle

Art Unit 2153

ABDULLAH SALAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

